CSCanada
Studies in Literature and Language
Vol. 7, No. 1, 2013, pp. 15-21
DOI:10.3968/j.sll.1923156320130701.2654

ISSN 1923-1555[Print]
ISSN 1923-1563[Online]
www.cscanada.net
www.cscanada.org

The Dialectic Between the Development of Consciousness and the Realization of Self: A Brief Look at Ursula in *The Rainbow*

ZHOU Weigui[a],*

[a]School of Foreign Languages, China West Normal University, China.
* Corresponding author

Received 17 November 2012; accepted 6 January 2013

Abstract

Ursula Brangwen is one main character in D. H. Lawrence's novel, *The Rainbow*, which presents to the readers a careful chronology of the progression of the Brangwens' family life. As a surrogate of Lawrence himself, Ursula's experience and mental growth, to a large extent, represent Lawrence's own philosophic concern and artistic pursuit. By investigating the growth of young Ursula, this article explores the dialectic between the development of consciousness and the realization of self from the perspective of Ecocritic approach. The development of consciousness makes one realize his ontological existence. However, to embrace a fully developed self, one has to be ontologically independent and, equally important, to establish a harmonious relationship with "the circumambient universe".

Key words: D. H. Lawrence; *The Rainbow*; Ontological consciousness; Spiritual ecology

ZHOU Weigui (2013). The Dialectic between the Development of Consciousness and the Realization of Self: A Brief Look at Ursula in *The Rainbow*. *Studies in Literature and Language, 7*(1), 15-21. Available from: http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/j.sll.1923156320130701.2654
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.sll.1923156320130701.2654

INTRODUCTION

The Rainbow, on first inspection, is a novel designed to explore the amatory and marital relationship between man and woman. However, on further examination, it is more than a novel about relationship. It is a novel on the development of consciousness and self in accord with the development of industrialization, just as John Worthen (1981, p.21) argues, "*The Rainbow* actually offers a history of the relation between man and what lies beyond him, and the history of the struggle of men to become conscious, to become themselves". Michael Bell (2003, p.180) confirms that "Like these philosophical thinkers, Lawrence understood the central problems of modernity as a complex psychological, cultural and ultimately ontological questions — questions, that is, about the nature of being…" This statement echoes Lawrence's own comment upon Thomas Hardy's fictional characters in his *Study of Thomas Hardy*, written simultaneously with *The Rainbow*, that "One thing about them is that none of the heroes and heroines care very much for money, or immediate self-preservation, and all of them are struggling hard to come into being" (2003a, p.152).

In *The Rainbow*, the progression of the Brangwen family coincidentally parallels the expansion of industrial civilization, the advance of mankind into modernity. Thus, in this novel Lawrence bears upon his shoulders the task to explore the development of consciousness awakened and stimulated by the "foreignness" of the ever-changing industrial world, as Balbert (1992, p. 263) points out, "It is the instinctive urge to find a reason for existence, to feel a sense of affirmation beyond the duties of work, to connect with something 'foreign' and beyond familial responsibility". The landscapes get widened and the experiences become various as the generations move on, yet there is always one thing that remains at the centre — the spontaneous being, which Lawrence tries to capture and define. Goldberg (1969, p.119) argues that "where the over-all pattern of the story is a gradual opening outwards, a widening range, the thematic pattern is a gradual concentrating, a process of clarification and application". In light of these findings, *The Rainbow* is certainly to be expected as a novel on the growth of consciousness. Therefore, *The Rainbow* is, in reality, Lawrence's arduous attempt to explore the social and the spiritual ecology

of his protagonists. In this novel, Ursula's story takes up almost half of the whole length and, as a surrogate of Lawrence himself, Ursula's experience and mental growth, to a large extent, represent Lawrence's own philosophic concern and artistic pursuit.

URSULA'S GROWTH AND HER SEARCH FOR SELF

The age when Ursula, the third generation in *The Rainbow*, comes to the fore roughly coincides with the late nineteenth century and the early years of twentieth century. Capitalism has firmly established its rule both politically and economically in England. Industrial civilization has reached the remote area of the country, and highly developed mechanization further alienates people from nature and, what's worse, from their occupation and their human nature. It is in this boisterous, yet disintegrating society that Ursula strives to establish her identity. Thus, the landscapes Ursula comes to know varies from the agrarian Marsh Farm to the urbanized city and her experiences are profoundly widened. Apart from the broadened experiences, education plays an even greater role upon Ursula's struggle into consciousness. Ursula passes the Matriculation Examination and serves as an elementary school teacher for two years. Then she goes to college for further education. She learns a lot about church and handiwork from her father; she reads a lot of classic works; she likes the subject of Botany. All these experiences remind Lawrence's readers that it is certainly Lawrence's own experiences that have shaped the character of Ursula, a complete new image of woman (man) in modern literary history.

When still a little child Ursula perceives a different adult world working by strange rules and judging by these rules she is helpless, vulnerable and small. Her father, a typical representative of this adult world, is "the dawn wherein her consciousness woke up" (184). Her closeness with her father offers her an opportunity to discover her own shadowy identity even at her childhood. Unable at this time to reconcile with the outside world, "very early she learned to harden her soul in resistance and denial of all that was outside her, harden herself upon her own being" (187). The superiority of the Brangwens in the community also kindles Ursula's consciousness of her self. This sense of difference is beneficial to the emergency of a separate individual. Thus, from the very early age Ursula longs for other people's recognition of her separateness and stateliness, though she wants the others to be her equal. However, the other people seem to pull the Brangwens down and belittle her existence. So when she is sent to the Grammar School in Nottingham at twelve, "she was glad to burst the narrow boundary of Cossethay, where only limited people lived" (221).

Similarly intolerable is her mother's complacency about her own fecundity because year after year new-born babies keep coming into the house. She detests her mother's authority over the house. In fact, there is "upon her always a fear and a dislike of authority" (227). She adores Jesus Christ, but hates the humanity embodied in Jesus which the vulgar minds insist upon. To Ursula, Jesus is an aristocrat-like individual who is "beautifully remote, shining in the distance, like a white moon at sunset" (231). Here readers familiar with Lawrence's philosophy may clearly recognize that Ursula is a surrogate for Lawrence himself. In his *Study of Thomas Hardy*, Lawrence (2003a, p.167) argues that "The glory of mankind is not in a host of secure, comfortable, law-abiding citizens, but in the few more fine, clear lives, beings, individuals, distinct, detached, single as may be from the public". These men are real aristocrats because they are "vivid, independent, individual men" (2003a, p.167). In Ursula's eyes, Jesus is such kind of aristocrat whose "Resurrection is to life, not to death" (236). Ursula dreams of such aristocrat-like son-of-God coming to take her as his lover and she gradually "became aware of herself, that she was a separate entity in the midst of an unseparated obscurity, that she must go somewhere, she must become something" (237). She knows that "one was more than responsible to the world. One was responsible to oneself." (238) Yet Ursula does not have a clue on "How to become oneself, how to know the question and the answer of oneself" (238) when her self is still undefined and unstated. Her goal is to seek, to realize her self, her individuality, though the process will pose great suffering.

When Skrebensky comes to the Brangwens' house, Ursula instantly acquires an impression that he is one of the aristocrat-like people she dreams of, because "He brought her a strong sense of the outer world. It was as if she were set on a hill and could feel vaguely the whole world lying spread before her" (243). His directness, his independence, his freedom, his spontaneity in movements and most important of all his knowledge of the outside world fascinate her. Ursula perceives the vividness in his pellucid, clear eyes and his beautiful figure. In Ursula's eyes, Skrebensky really embraces an independent self, as "He seemed simply acquiescent in the fact of his own being, as if he were beyond any change and question" (244). His face often reminds her of the eagle, established, isolated. All these characteristics suggest that "he had a nature like fate, the nature of an aristocrat" (244). Through Skrebensky, Ursula perceives the vast world and large masses of humanity as from a hole on the wall. Tired of the confined domesticity and the noise of babies, Ursula longs to go out and explore the unknown world. Her love for Skrebensky is partly stimulated by the "foreign" elements embodied in him. During their early period of intimacy, Ursula develops her self by regarding Skrebensky's independence as frame of reference and she wants to be one such aristocrat like him. Thus, their

intimacy is "a magnificent self-assertion on the part of both of them…she asserted herself before him…what could either of them get from such a passion but a sense of his or of her own maximum self…" (254) She tries to define her self against Skrebensky and succeeds in a limited way.

However, as their intimacy develops Ursula vaguely perceives the illusion of her fascination with Skrebensky's aristocracy. Skrebensky is one of those modern people who want to pledge themselves to "some greater ideas, some barely understood abstraction" (Dorbad, 1991, p.84). He "not only sacrifices his chances of further creative and spiritual growth but also indicates his inherent opposition to change and reckless adventure" (Dorbad, 1991, p.84). As John Worthen (1981, p.22) points out, "Skrebensky… is at first the man limited by his abstension from self, submitted as he is to the power of established society…" During his discussion with Ursula about war he argues that "You want to have room to live in: and somebody has to make room" (260) and "I belong to the nation and must do my duty by the nation" (261). In his long paper of criticism on John Galsworthy Lawrence (2003a, p.130) regretfully points out that "the fatal change today is the collapse from the psychology of the free human individual into the psychology of the social being, just as the fatal change in the past was a collapse from the freeman's psyche to the psyche of the slave". The readers can definitely make out the ironic "collapse" of Skrebensky as a slave to the idea of the country, the nation but only not to himself. Ursula, eager to be loved and to undergo further experiences, longs to enjoy the independence and vividness Skrebensky manifests, but she also realizes that "Skrebensky, somehow, had created a deadness round her, a sterility as if the world were ashes" (265). Skrebensky embraces no intrinsic life because "His life lay in the established order of things" (276). Fortunately, their further attachment is temporally suspended due to Skrebensky's mission in the war with Boers in South Africa.

Just as Schwarz (1992, p.255) points out, "Ursula is at ease in nature and open to experience", Ursula will not stop her search for fulfillment. She turns her passion to a seemingly aristocrat-like woman, Winifred Inger. Winifred gives her an impression that she has fine, upright, athletic bearing, and indomitably proud nature. Their lesbian love, however, proves to be a failure at last, because Winifred, like Skrebensky, also pursues some pallid ideas, as her meditation on the Women's Movement shows. What's more, her sensual love for Ursula is perverted because her soul is lifeless, engendering a sense of deadness upon Ursula. Ursula is quite clear that Winifred will make a good match for her Uncle Tom, a colliery manager who lives in a lifeless and dirty coal town, because both Tom and Winifred "had all ended in a disintegrated lifelessness of soul" (290). What Uncle Tom impresses the readers most is his marshy corruption. His mind, alienated from the natural world, tends to enslave his body and his inherent nature. As an intellectual who has received higher education, he perceives clearly the alienating forces enclosed in the machine, yet he does not want to make any alteration except to follow the machine in a state of inertia. He has actually murdered his own humanity or inborn nature as "He did not care any more, neither about his body nor about his soul" (290). When such people like Uncle Tom become the ruling members of the society, their devastating influence upon the society is immeasurable. The colliery town in which Uncle Tom lives is completely an embodiment of ugliness in Ursula's eyes, and what's more the colliers living in the town "seemed not like living people, but like specters" (290). In Ursula's eyes, the colliers in Wiggiston embrace no individuality. They seem like moving specters with no inherent energy. The colliery town bears no resemblance to the pastoral Marsh Farm, which suggests the complete fall of mankind from the grace of the paradise.

After Ursula finishes school, she wants to plunge into the men's world so as to earn her own living rather than depend upon her parents. Her father finds for her a teacher's position at St. Philip's School. Yet the operation of the school follows invariably a mechanical system which tramples on the children's sensitive hearts. The development of the children's spontaneous nature is handicapped by the strong will of the school master and the inhuman education system. They are trained to be obedient and submissive to the power of the authority. Thus, Ursula, who wants to be quite personal with them, fails in front of the collective will of the children, because they are only ready to comply with the impersonal authority. Ursula, after painful struggle, has no choice but to alter her spontaneous self and to comply with the inhuman system. This submission, however, is intolerable to Ursula and she can only find relief in the natural world. After two years at the school, she is happy to leave that place and later go to Nottingham University College. She is content with college during her first year there, because she is glad to absorb knowledge and the professors seem to be priests preaching the mystery of knowledge. Ursula, however, gradually realizes the hypocrisy of the college education, as her meditation profoundly suggests that the college is "a little, slovenly laboratory for the factory" and "a second-hand dealer's shop, and one bought an equipment for an examination. This was only a little side-show to the factories of the town." (366) This exclamation is expressly made by the cynical and sensitive Lawrence himself. The whole education system, both at the elementary level and the advanced level, is only a highly intricate machine which tramples on human nature and serves as instrument for the industrial civilization.

Ursula, however, remains interested in Botany and often labors in her botany laboratory, "for there the

mystery still glimmered" (367). Yet one of her teachers, Dr Frankstone, a woman doctor of physics, even attempts to strip Ursula of her fascination with the mystery of life, as she says:

> 'I don't see why we should attribute some special mystery to life — do you? We don't understand it as we understand electricity, even, but that doesn't warrant our saying it is something special, something different in kind and distinct from everything else in the universe — do you think it does? May it not be that life consists in a complexity of physical and chemical activities, of the same order as the activities we already know in science? I don't see, really, why we should imagine there is a special order of life, and life alone —' (371)

As a scientist, Frankstone's belief represents the general idea of many rationalists and scientists. Rationalism has been established as the criterion of modern science since the Age of Enlightenment. Influenced greatly by the scientific revolution, many philosophers, some of them also scientists, "attempted to explain human thought and behavior in mechanical terms" (Stumpf & Fieser, 2006, pp.206-207). They regard science as an essential and experimental system which is based on man's rationality and strict adherence to mathematic language. "They emphasized the rational capacity of the human mind, which they now considered the source of truth both about human nature and the world" and "They saw little value in subjective feeling and enthusiasm as means for discovering truth" (Stumpf and Fieser, 2006, p.222). What's more, "all the rationalists ascribed determinism to all physical events, interpreting the natural world after the mechanical model of physics" (Stumpf and Fieser, 2006, p.222). They do not hold life in awe because they just view life as a kind of mechanical energy which can be calculated and predicated through human reason.

Through Ursula, Lawrence's challenge to rationalism is explicit and effective. Glicksberg (1951, p.99), though, launches an attack upon Lawrence's irrationalism, he justifiably spells out that "The one who warred most bitterly and most brilliantly against the deadening effects of the philosophy of science and the scientific method was D. H. Lawrence…" After Ursula's conversation with Frankstone, she feels suspicious about this mechanical view of life. Truly, life necessitates some physical and chemical forces, but human beings have soul while "Electricity had no soul, light and heat had no soul" (371). Life certainly is more than the conjunction of some physical and chemical forces. In her meditation on the mystery of life when she observes the plant-animal under her microscope, Ursula gradually realizes the mystery of self:

> Suddenly in her mind the world gleamed strangely, with an intense light, like the nucleus of the creature under the microscope. Suddenly she had passed away into an intensely-gleaming light of knowledge. She could not understand what it all was. She only knew that it was not limited mechanical energy, nor mere purpose of self-preservation, and self-assertion. It was a consummation, a being infinite. Self was a oneness with the infinite. To be oneself was a supreme, gleaming triumph of infinity. (372)

Ursula's discovery refutes the mechanical view of life. Her new finding quite conforms to the belief of animism. Lawrence is also regarded by some critics as a modern writer who consciously advocates primitivism, attracted by the idea of the noble savage "as being closer to the primal sources of life, undistracted by self-consciousness and merely intellectual awareness" (Salgado, 2005, p.81). Donald Gutierrez, however, prefers to use another term, hylozoism, which he thinks is "more effective and accurate than terms like primitivism and animism in depicting a key area of Lawrence's creative imagination" (1981, p.178). Gutierrez explains that "hylozoism refers to the archaic pre-Socratic conception that all matter is alive, or that life and matter are indivisible" (1981, p.178). The use of animism or primitivism tends to "confine their meaning to something either clinically archaeological or irresponsibly savage" (1981, p.179). Hylozoism, however, "would encompass not only a conception of inorganic matter or forms of thought of less 'complex' minds or societies" but also "a striking and possibly ancient mode of thought as well as a dazzling sense of interpenetration between man and nature conspicuous in the works of certain literary artists and philosophers" (1981, p.179). Ursula arrives at a conclusion that "Self was a oneness with the infinite" and "It was a consummation, a being infinite" (372). Self does not exist independently; it exists in a network in which everything is interrelated while at the same time inter-subjective. A real, vital connection with the cosmos should be established. Thus, Ursula does not only perceive the non-mechanical operation of life, but also affirm the interrelation between man and nature, self and the infinite.

Equally significant is Ursula's perception of the vanity of human camp. Even when she is still a student in school, she suspects the vanity of the Bible, in which God dictates that "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth" and "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things" (273). The teachings of the Bible here give people a warranty to master the earth and to make all the things man's property. The anthropocentric vision is prominently revealed in these teachings. Ursula feels disgusted at "man's stock-breeding lordship over beasts and fishes" (273). In fact, some scholars, including some ecocritics, have launched an attack upon the Bible, especially the opening part of Genesis. American historian Lynn White points out in his famous "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis" that "Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen" and "Christianity, in absolute contrast to ancient paganism and Asia's religions (except, perhaps, Zoroastrianism), not only established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for

his proper ends" (White, 1967, p.1205). He convincingly asserts that "Both our present science and our present technology are so tinctured with orthodox Christian arrogance toward nature that no solution for our ecologic crisis can be expected from them alone" (White, 1967, p.1207).

When Ursula studies in college, she again realizes the vanity of human's anthropocentric vision, as her meditation suggests:

> This world in which she lived was like a circle lighted by a lamp…suddenly it seemed like the area under an arc-lamp, wherein the moths and children played in the security of blinding light, not even knowing there was any darkness, because they stayed in the light.
>
> But…she saw the eyes of the wild beast gleaming from the darkness, watching the vanity of the camp fire and the sleepers; she felt the strange, foolish vanity of the camp, which said 'Beyond our light and our order there is nothing,' turning their faces always inward towards the sinking fire of illuminating consciousness… ignoring always the vast darkness that wheeled round about, which half-revealed shapes lurking on the edge. (368-369)

Nobody even dares to acknowledge the world beyond the lighted camp, a symbol of human society; otherwise he will be jeered to death by the others and accused of "anti-social knave". The vanity of man prevents him from seeing the nonhuman world. Man encircles himself within the camp light and the light serves as a sheath separating man and nature. Here Ursula is well aware of man's ignorant anthropocentric vision which is the cultural reason for the environmental crisis. Man is content with the lighted area, the human society, and he does not care what's beyond human society. The nonhuman world, to him, is nothing but the "environment" serving people's welfare. Mournfully, the anthropocentric vision is universally accepted as the established morality in the western culture.

So far Ursula's consciousness of her self is almost fully developed and keenly insightful, though later Ursula has another unsuccessful relationship with Skrebensky and her self is nearly sacrificed by the temptation of a peaceful, yet parasitical life with him. Skrebensky proves to be more corrupt than the former aristocrat-like Skrebensky because he serves now only as a brick to the wall of capitalist nationalism and an instrument to the imperialist colonialism. Feeling disgusted, empty and ill, Ursula takes a walk and comes across a group of horses which seem cruel and destructive. But Ursula perceives the power, the spontaneity inherent in these horses:

> She was aware of their breasts gripped, clenched narrow in a hold that never relaxed, she was aware of their red nostrils flaming with long endurance, and of their haunches, so rounded, so massive, pressing, pressing, pressing to burst the grip upon their breasts, pressing forever till they went mad, running against the walls of time, and never bursting free. Their great haunches were smoothed and darkened with rain. But the darkness and wetness of rain could not put out the hard urgent, massive fire that was locked within these flanks, never, never. (412)

Even in the rain, Ursula can perceive the fire locked in their body. The life force in these horse is so strong that Ursula nearly faints in front of these horses. "Her heart was gone, she had no more heart…Her heart was gone, her limbs were dissolved like water. All the hardness and looming power was in the massive body of the horse-group" (413). She is frightened, but she is forced and stimulated to take action, her hands as hard as steel, and she knows that she is strong. At last she gets rid of the horse-group. Yet, in the suffering encounter with these horses, Ursula learns from these horses. The horse-group with their spontaneity and instinct inspires the birth of a new self. The positive power inherent in nature, especially those powerful horses, knocks Ursula out of her disillusionment resulting from her failure in love. After several days of illness, she sits at the window and finds a rainbow gradually taking form. The rainbow, as a symbol of hope and a divine revelation, is a promise of a new world. Ursula's apocalyptic vision that a holistic world where people live in harmony with nature would be built up is revealed to the readers through Ursula's perception of a rainbow, which is a flash of epiphany in Ursula's unconsciousness. The divine rainbow makes Ursula retain the hope for a better world and, different from the Bible, it is a covenant signed between man and the holy universe rather than between man and God. Under the rainbow a new world with clean rain is occupied by new and naked people who respect life and nature. This world is an organic community where germination and growth are the central facts for man's life, with corruption free and factories away. The apocalyptic vision is a promise of future wonderland where man lives in harmony with the circumambient universe. It is exactly from this perspective that Lawrence's apocalyptic vision is under attack from some critics. However, it must be admitted that Ursula's vision of a new world is quite personal and quite consistent with her own groping for self definition. Eugene Goodheart's comment on Lawrence is quite pertinent when he says "Lawrence's value is that he keeps us alive to the world beyond 'the little fold of law and order,' but he does not teach us how to live in the community of men" (1992, p.432).

Ursula's exploration, however, does not come to an end in *The Rainbow*, and *Women in Love*, as a sequel to the former, presents to the reader Ursula's further exploration into the possibilities of being. Concerning the relationship between *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, "Critics have noticed that it ends as it were between two testaments — it is a version of human history as sealed by a covenant of the Old Testament, the rainbow, and it prophesies 'the covenant of a New" (Kermode, 1992, p.479). *Women in Love*, however, focuses not only on Ursula's individual development, but also on the exploration of Birkin, a self-portrait of Lawrence himself. The development of industrialization does not suggest any trace of slowing

down and the promise of a new world as suggested at the end of *The Rainbow* is still obscure and hard to fulfill. The reader perceives more corruption in the persona of Gerald, the son of a colliery owner, and his effective measures taken to modernize the colliery. Like *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love* still ends with Birkin's apocalyptical vision of the world, as his meditation suggests: "If humanity ran into a cul-de-sac, and expended itself, the timeless creative mystery would bring forth some other being, finer, more wonderful, some new, more lovely race, to carry on the embodiment of creation…The mystery of creation was fathomless, infallible, inexhaustible, for ever" (*Women in Love*, 538). The tone of his meditation, however, is unparalleled bitterness, caused by the strong disillusionment with the industrial civilization.

Ursula, regardless of her unruliness, bears a marked resemblance to Jesus Christ. Jesus preached the Gospel to the people, while the story of Ursula aims to enlighten the people on how to fulfill their being. Jesus urged people to acquire their salvation by living and thinking and acting in a way which tended to the glory of God, while Ursula's exploration tends to inform people of the necessity of independence in their own being as a sole way to salvation. Through his surrogate Ursula, Lawrence's philosophy can be plumbed from two distinct yet closely related dimensions. First and foremost, due to the development of consciousness, man has realized the ontological existence of himself and the objective existence of nature. Lawrence does not consider the development of consciousness as historical retrogression. On the contrary, his exploration in *The Rainbow* testifies that "the ultimate goal of relationship is that relationship-in-freedom between separate, fully conscious, individual beings…" (Brown, 1992, p.223) What Lawrence suggests is that "The true movement, for modern man…is always outward to a fuller consciousness beyond that of the mind" (Brown, 1992, pp.217-218). The more man becomes conscious, the more he is fulfilled and individualized. Thus, he should not sacrifice his individuality for false conventions, principles and fixed moral ideals. His individuality, or isolation in his own being, is what he should always stick to, as Lawrence (2003a, p.170) argues, "By individualist is meant, not a selfish or greedy person, anxious to satisfy appetites, but a man of distinct being, who must act in his own particular way to fulfill his individual nature". Even couples must recognize the boundary between each other and respect the other's independency. What's more, his intuitive apprehension and emotion should not be severely repressed, because they are closer to one's inner being and inherent nature, thus more congenial to one's spontaneous self. Reason, as a secondary capacity, is invoked to complement intuition rather than to trample on it.

On the other hand, mankind lives in both nature and society. He must seek a harmonious relationship with "the circumambient universe", though he can no longer return to the pastoral or primitive life in the past, as suggested by Ursula's refusal to live a pastoral life with Anthony at Belcote, because she sees the beauty of nature, while Anthony, as one lives in it, does not see the separateness of nature. It is for this reason that she has a soul due to her developed consciousness, while Anthony, like the Brangwen forbears, does not have a soul. However, man's separation from nature does not warrant man's manipulation of nature. He should discard his anthropocentric vision and respect the mystery of nature. Ursula comes to realize that "Self was a oneness with the infinite" (372). Lawrence (2000, p.72) overtly professes that "life itself consists in a live relatedness between man and his universe: sun, moon, stars, earth, trees, flowers, birds, animals, men, everything — and not in a 'conquest' of anything by anything. Even the conquest of the air makes the world smaller, tighter, and airless". Thus man must recognize the divinity of nature and seek a harmonious relationship with nature. This harmonious relationship should also be achieved between man and his compeers, husband and wife. The precondition of this relationship is the recognition of the other's independency, just as Lawrence (2003b, p.67) himself suggests in his article about Edgar Allan Poe, "The central law of all organic life is that each organism is intrinsically isolate and single in itself" and "the secondary law of all organic life, is that each organism only lives through contact with other matter, assimilation, and contact with other life, which means assimilation of new vibrations, non-material". This statement can serve as Lawrence's central philosophical standpoint concerning man's ecological existence. The sacrifice of either the circumambient nature or the human individuality is an impediment to the maintenance of man's integrity.

SUMMARY

To Lawrence, the birth of self-consciousness separates mankind from a close and unconscious intimacy with nature. Since man's consciousness has been fully developed, he can no longer return to a primitive relationship with nature. The key to this world is a living relatedness between any single man and his circumambient universe. This relatedness, however, can not be obtained through a degradation of his own independence. Any harmonious relationship presupposes an isolated being. To be a real and aristocratic man, he must not sacrifice his own self to serve for any abstraction. Possessive love tends to ruin the relationship because it is a form of self-evasion; possessive control over nature tends to dehumanize man because his natural bond with nature will snap finally. As a writer eager to expose the evil of industrialization, Lawrence's philosophical pursuit still remains profound and keen to modern readers.

REFERENCES

Balbert, P. (1992). Logic of the soul: Prothalamic pattern in *The Rainbow*. In Ellis, D. & Zordo, O. D. (Eds.), *D. H. Lawrence: Critical Assessments*, Vol. II (pp.242-259). Mountfield: Helm Information.

Bell, M. (2003). Lawrence and modernism. In A. Fernihough (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to D. H. Lawrence* (pp.179-196). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Brown, H. O. (1992). 'The Passionate Struggle into Conscious Being': D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow*. In D. Ellis & O. D. Zordo (Eds.), *D. H. Lawrence: Critical assessments*, Vol. II (pp.214-225). Mountfield: Helm Information.

Dorbad, L. J. (1991). *Sexually balanced relationships in the novels of D. H. Lawrence*. Now York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Glicksberg, C. I. (1951). D. H. Lawrence and science. *The Scientific Monthly*, *73*(2), 99-104.

Goldberg, S. L. (1969). *The Rainbow*: Fiddle-box and Sand. In C. Clarke (Ed.), *D. H. Lawrence: The rainbow and women in love, a casebook* (pp.117-134). Basingstoke and London: Macmillan.

Goodheart, E. (1992). Lawrence and the Critics. In D. Ellis & O. D. Zordo (Eds.), *D. H. Lawrence: Critical assessments*, Vol. IV (pp.425-433). Mountfield: Helm Information.

Gutierrez, D. (1981). The ancient imagination of D. H. Lawrence. *Twentieth Century Literature*, *27*(2), 178-196.

Kermode, F. (1992). The novels of D. H. Lawrence. In Ellis, D., & Zordo, O. D. (Eds.), *D. H. Lawrence: Critical assessments*, *IV* (pp.473-485). Mountfield: Helm Information.

Lawrence, D. H. (1993). *Women in love*. Beijing: Foreign Language Press.

— (1995). *The rainbow*. Ware: Wordsworth Classics.

— (2000). Remembering Pan. In L. Coupe (Ed.), *The green studies reader: From romanticism to ecocriticism* (pp.70-72). London and New York: Routledge.

— (2003a). John Galsworthy; *Study of Thomas Hardy* (excerpts). In Zhu Tongbo (Ed.), *D. H Lawrence: Selected literary critiques* (pp.127-145, 151-218). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

—(2003b). *Studies in classic American literature*. Greenspan, E., Vasey, L., & Worthen, J. (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salgado, G. (2005). *A preface to D. H. Lawrence*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

Schwarz, D. (1992). Lawrence's quest in *The Rainbow*. In Ellis, D., & Zordo, O. D. (Eds.), *D. H. Lawrence: Critical assessments*, Vol. II (pp.242-259). Mountfield: Helm Information.

Stumpf, S. E., & Fieser, J. (2006). *A history of philosophy: Socrates to Sartre and beyond*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

White, L. Jr. (1967). The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis. *Science*. New Series, 155(3767), 1203-1207.

Worthen, J. (1981). Introduction to *The Rainbow*. In Lawrence, D. H., *The Rainbow* (pp.11-33). Harmondsworth: Penguin.